



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Rationalising the Irrational? How to Make Sense of Member States' Responses to the Asylum Crisis

Citation for published version:

Odmalm, P, *Rationalising the Irrational? How to Make Sense of Member States' Responses to the Asylum Crisis*, 2015, Web publication/site, European Futures, Edinburgh.
<<http://www.europeanfutures.ed.ac.uk/article-2493>>

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publisher Rights Statement:

© 2015 Pontus Odmalm. Published under Creative Commons (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 International) License

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Rationalising the Irrational? How to Make Sense of Member States' Responses to the Asylum Crisis

Author(s): Pontus Odmalm

Permalink: <http://www.europeanfutures.ed.ac.uk/article-2493>

Publication: 22 December 2015

Article text:

*Mainstream political parties in Europe have largely found it difficult to develop coherent policies to address the asylum crisis, writes **Pontus Odmalm**. He suggests that, unless party elites can connect their ideologies with policy solutions and navigate arguments on policy competence, the response to the crisis may continue to be haphazard and ineffective.*

2015 proved to be the year when the immigration 'issue' reached a critical mass. The number of people attempting to reach (Western) Europe has been on a scale not seen for almost [twenty-five years](#). Responses from some Member States have been [chaotic](#) at best, [dysfunctional](#) at worst.

Elizabeth Collett [suggests](#) that 'beyond the self-determination of those seeking asylum is the political self-interest of states', and that the two have effectively put human and policy interests on a collision course. The positions initially adopted by some leaders (such as [Angela Merkel](#) and [Stefan Lövfén](#)) have equally put Member States at odds [with each other](#).

Although both countries are now attempting to reverse on these earlier liberal stances, their responses are likely to magnify the (strong) pull effect that the EU already constitutes for those fleeing war and persecution.

Several commentators have pointed out the seemingly [knee-jerk reaction](#) to the asylum crisis, expressing astonishment that no one anticipated the [vast numbers](#) that would eventually reach European shores. Although they make a valid point, such narratives downplay the [ideological difficulties](#) that immigration and asylum can cause, especially to parties labelled as mainstream rather than as radical and/or extreme.

These ideational challenges stem from [conflicting views](#) on how to interpret the immigration 'issue'. The [centre-left](#) has traditionally pushed a position aimed at limiting labour migration while simultaneously supporting asylum and family reunification.

This approach made sense as long as the centre-left remained sceptical of too much market influence and championed an internationalist and human rights agenda. The [centre-right](#)'s approach of tolerating (skilled) labour migration, yet

being hesitant towards other types of migrants, also corresponded to their ideological orientations.

Yet [‘the death of ideology’](#) and current events have reshuffled positions so often that they now seem to have come full circle. ‘Numbers’, public opinion and state resources are obviously important factors for understanding elite responses in this context. So too is the type of party tasked to deal with this societal challenge.

As noted [elsewhere](#), politics is increasingly about which party, or which government, is ‘better’ at delivering on key policies. The handling of asylum and immigration is no exception. Parties and governments constantly have to fend off [accusations of incompetence](#) or of allowing the [level of newcomers](#) to become too high and/or out of control. The seemingly irrational responses from political leaders to the migration crisis may start to make (somewhat) more sense when viewed from these two perspectives.

The pursuit of approval ratings is often put forward to explain why mainstream parties appear to have [‘forgotten’](#) who they are. But one could also interpret the ‘collision course’ argument as being a sign of ideology’s continued relevance.

However, bringing back ideology has not always meant more clarity. Nor has it meant a more obvious course of action for parties to pursue. Instead, it has added further complexity to an already complex political environment, and those ‘old’ solutions that parties have relied upon no longer seem appropriate.

In part, this relates to the ideological reinvention that has taken place on the left, and also on the right. The shift to become more market friendly should have provided parts of the centre-left with more ideological harmony, as it should have done to parts of the centre-right who equally embarked on journey to moderate some of their conservative and authoritarian views.

But the success of these changes also relied on rank-and-file members and individual MPs accepting these elite views, and that they subsequently sign up to these ‘new’ ideological directions. Playing the competence card can therefore be seen as a tactic parties use to signal that they are in control and on top of things. But one can just as easily observe that a majority of European governments have not been particularly in control, nor have they been particularly on top of things.

Little wonder, then, that responses to the crisis have been largely incoherent and subject to various twists and turns over the past few months. Parties have had to deal not only with longstanding questions of figuring out who they are, but they have also struggled with leadership issues and with convincing the electorate that their solutions are better than those of their opponents. If these challenges are not resolved (or at least addressed in the short-term), then they may well continue to provide sustained fuel for the populist radical right.

Author information:

Pontus Odmalm
The University of Edinburgh

Dr Pontus Odmalm is Senior Lecturer in Politics at the University of Edinburgh. His research focuses on the social and political impact of migration using a comparative European perspective, and his latest book is [*The Party Politics of the EU and Immigration*](#) (Palgrave, 2014).

Publication license:

Creative Commons (Attribution–NonCommercial–NoDerivatives 4.0 International)

Additional information:

Please note that this article represents the view of the author(s) alone and not European Futures, the Edinburgh Europa Institute nor the University of Edinburgh.